



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,785	12/13/2001	Michael C. Sanders	1662-39100 (P98-2403)	6110
23505	7590	08/08/2005		EXAMINER
CONLEY ROSE, P.C. P. O. BOX 3267 HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267			DEBERADINIS, ROBERT L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/017,785	SANDERS ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert DeBerardinis	Art Unit 2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-24 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/23/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JONES US 2003/0065730.

Regarding claims 1, 7, 16, 17, 18.

JONES discloses a plurality of modular server chassis, each chassis configured to hold a plurality of servers (paragraph 0029) and at least one data aggregator (paragraph 0036) coupled to each server in the same chassis via a point to point link (80); at least one group of AC to DC power supplies (44); a power bus bar configured to transmit power from the power supplies to a power backplane in each server chassis (paragraph 0045); wherein DC power is provided to each server in the rack through the power bus bar and the power backplane in the same chassis.

Regarding claim 2.

JONES teaches a second group of AC to DC power supplies (44) configured to transmit power to the power backplane in each server chassis (20) through the power bus bar; wherein DC power from both the first and the second groups of AC to DC power supplies is provided to each server (30) in the rack through the power bus bar and the power backplane located in the same chassis.

Regarding claim 3.

JONES discloses wherein servers in a chassis are coupled to a network by coupling the aggregator (80) in the same rack to the network.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 14, 15.

JONES is silent as to an IP network switch and an infiniband network switch.

JONES however teaches de-allocation of power in a server system 100 (paragraph 0047) the network switching would be an inherent part of the system to maintain redundancy.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JONES in view of SLAUGHTER 5,598,536.

Regarding claim 9.

JONES discloses the method of claim 8.

JONES is silent as to enclosing each server in a blade enclosure.

SLAUGHTER teaches enclosing the server 16 (column 3, line 44).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to modify the server blade to include an enclosure. The motivation would be to protect the server component mounted on the blade.

Regarding claims 10, 11.

JONES discloses subdividing the power supplies into at least two groups; transmitting power from each group of power supplies to a separate power transmission line bus bar; transmitting power from each power transmission line to each server and switch in each chassis through a power backplane at the rear of each chassis (see figure 4 and associated text).

Claims 6, 8, 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JONES.

Regarding claims 6, 8.

JONES teaches full redundancy (paragraph 0046).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to modify the server chassis disclosed by JONES to include a second aggregator coupled to each server. The motivation would be to provide full redundancy for the system.

Regarding claims 20-22.

JONES is silent as to the type of connectors used for each server slot.

It is obvious that JONES uses connectors to connect the server blades to the backplane in order to transmit signal from point to point over a connecting network and it would be obvious to use high density connectors to conserve space.

Regarding claims 23, 24.

JONES teaches standard unit of measurement for indicating the density of rack mounted server system is unit "U" equal to 1.75 inches (paragraphs 006, 007).

It would be obvious to provide the dimensions for a server chassis capable of holding server blades and switches to provide the redundant interface required for the system interface.

Claims 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JONES in view of SLAUGHTER 5,598,536 in view CANNELLA 6,144,561.

Regarding claims 12, 13.

JONES in view of SLAUGHTER discloses the method of claim 9.

JONES in view of SLAUGHTER does not teach encapsulating the point to point links in a data backplane; and coupling a data connector at the rear of each server blade enclosure with a mating server data connector on the data backplane.

CANNELLA teaches coupling a data connector assembly on the data backplane wherein the assembly includes a printed circuit board (PWP 60) with active and passive components are mounted to provide an interface (column 7, lines 3-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to mount a coupling data connector on the backplane. The motivation would be to provide a controlled cable interface for the server.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 19 allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert L. DeBerardinis whose number is (571) 272-2049. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on (571) 272-2058. The Fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

RLD

AUGUST 2, 2005



ROBERT L. DEBERARDINIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER